

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner and the Supervising Examiner for participating in the interview on March 20, 2007. The amendment below of claim 1 was discussed, as was the prior art of record. Applicant articulated the differences between the present subject matter and the main reference. While no agreement was reached, it was indicated from the Examiners' side that they would analyze the reference against the amended claims upon the filing of this response.

In response to the office action dated December 21, 2006, Applicant is amending claims 1, 3, 10, 11, 14 and 16-17. Dependent claims 2 and 15 are being canceled without prejudice. As such, claims 1, 3-14 and 16-18 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 11 and 14 are independent claims. Favorable consideration of the claims as amended in view of the following remarks is requested.

Claim 1 is being amended to recite that each of the database objects has "stored therewith" one of a plurality of predetermined contexts. This is supported by the present disclosure, for example in the description of the objects 114 and the contexts 116. Specification, page 3, line 27—page 4, line 2. Claim 1 is also amended to explicitly recite "identifying, in response to the input, one of the plurality of predetermined contexts that is associated with the selected database object". This is supported, for example, by the description of the exemplary contexts "U.S." and "Germany" with reference to Figure 3. 5:26—6:23. Claim 1 is also amended to explicitly recite "selecting one of a plurality of panel selection controls using the identified context, each of the plurality of panel selection controls being associated with one of the predetermined contexts" and "the selected panel selection control providing that the user can select for display any of the panels that are relevant to the context of the selected database object, wherein any of the selectable panels that are relevant also to a different context can also be selected in a panel selection control associated with the different context". This is supported, for example, by the description of the "Control 1 (DE)" with reference to Figure 3. 6:15-23. Claim 1 is also amended to explicitly recite "displaying the selected panel selection control in the user interface". This is also supported, for example, by the description of the "Control 1 (DE)". 6:15-23. Similar changes are made in the independent claim 10 (a computer program product claim), in the independent claim 11 (a computer system claim) and in the independent claim 14 (a

repository claim). Corresponding changes are being made in some of the dependent claims. No new matter is added.

Moreover, the independent claims 10, 11 and 14 are being amended to recite “a computer readable medium” as requested in the office action. Support for this amendment is found in the description of the objects 114, contexts 116, panels 118 and panel selection controls 120 in Figure 1. 3:25—4:12. No new matter is added.

Dependent claim 2 was rejected under § 112, second paragraph, because of a lack of antecedent basis. Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing this out, and submit that the rejection is moot by the cancellation of dependent claim 2.

Claims 10-18 were rejected under § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The independent claims 10, 11 and 14 have been amended to mention a computer readable medium. Applicants ask that the rejection be removed in view of the amendments, but are not conceding that the rejection has merit.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. 20030184584 (“Vachuska”) in view of U.S. 5,428,731 (“Powers”). This rejection is moot in view of the amendments above, but Applicants submit the following comments about the differences between the present subject matter and the references.

Vachuska relates to a user interface framework for integrating user interface elements of independent software components. Vachuska title. Particularly, Figure 1 of Vachuska shows a user interface 10 that is provided by the framework and that includes a hierarchy of objects in a tree list 14. Vachuska describes that a view panel 18 of a selected tree object can be presented in the user interface. Moreover, tabs 20, back/forward buttons 20 (sic) and buttons 24 and 26 are described as being presented in the user interface.

Applicant notes that for those of Vachuska's objects that have several panels, the “panels are displayed as a tabbed pane”. [Vachuska 0031.] There is no disclosure or suggestion that such a “tabbed pane” should be associated with, or selected using, a context of the selected object. Rather, Vachuska appears to have the “tabbed pane” directly associated with the selected object such that no intervening identification of context is necessary or even possible.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Vachuska does not teach or suggest the “identifying” and “selecting” steps recited in the present claim 1.

The mentioning of “context” in Vachuska is not to the contrary. First, Vachuska teaches that there can be several NavObject trees—any one of which the Examiner apparently contends corresponds to the “objects” in the present subject matter. Moreover, Vachuska states regarding the NavObject trees that “each represent[s] a separate context”. [Vachuska 0032.] But if the NavObjects in a tree are associated with the context represented by that tree, then it follows that the panel selection control that Vachuska uses for one of the NavObjects in the tree is “chosen” using the same context as for another object in the tree. Accordingly, Vachuska fails to disclose or suggest the selection of a panel selection control using the context of the selected object, as required by the present claims.

Second, the Examiner mentioned during the interview that Vachuska teaches a “context-sensitive popup menu”. [Vachuska 0037.] Applicant submits, like in the interview, that “context-sensitive” in relation to a popup menu appears to denote that the menu can look differently depending on the object being pointed to when the menu is initiated. This is confirmed by Vachuska’s teaching regarding the popup menu that “UI components can register as a *PopupContributor for a NavObject* to add custom menu items.” [Vachuska 0037, emphasis added.] Thus, the Vachuska popup menu appears to be tied to the individual object, similar to the “tabbed pane” discussed above. As such, there is no disclosure or suggestion that one should identify the context of a selected object and select the panel selection control using that identified context. Accordingly, the popup menu does not correspond to a panel selection control as required by the present claims.

For at least the above reasons, Vachuska does not anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of the present claim 1. Independent claims 10, 11 and 14 recite language similar to that discussed above. The independent claims and their dependent claims are therefore patentable over Vachuska, alone or in combination.

Powers was cited as showing that “object can be used by more than one other object.” Office action page 4. But the office action did not contend that Powers discloses or suggests any

other feature of claim 1. Without conceding that the characterization of Powers in the office action is correct, Applicant submits that Powers does not teach or suggest identifying a context of a selected object, and selecting a panel selection control using the identified object, as required by the present claim 1.

Applicants requests favorable consideration of claims 1, 3-14 and 16-18.


It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

This response is filed within the shortened statutory period and no fee is therefore due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

3/21/07



J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696